

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 13 2006

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-24 and 31-61 remain pending. Claims 7-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-24 and 31-61 have been rejected.

Claims 7, 13, 17, 20, 31, 40, and 45 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicant submits that the amendments do not add new matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13, 14, 40-43, 55 and 60 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 13, 14, 40, 55, and 60 to overcome the Examiner rejection.

Therefore, applicant submits that claims 13, 14, 40, 55, and 60 are patentable over 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Given that claims 41-43 depend from amended claim 40, applicant submits that claims 41-43 are patentable over 35 U.S.C. § 101.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-24 and 31-61 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,573,199 to Chen, et al. ("Chen"), in view of 6,384,827 to Dawkins ("Dawkins") and in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (May

1993) ("IBM"). Bril et al. discloses simulating the second font based on the first font (col. 7, line 1 through col. 8, line 67)" (Office Action, p. 3, 09/14/06).

In the conversation with Tatiana Rossin on December 12, 2006 the Examiner Kimbinh T. Nguyen acknowledged that reference to Chen in 103(a) rejection in the Office Action from 09/14/06 was made inadvertently by mistake. The Examiner stated that claims 7-10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-24 and 31-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,742,298 to Bril, et al. ("Bril"), in view of 6,384,827 to Dawkins ("Dawkins") and in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (May 1993) ("IBM") instead.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions and characterization of the cited references.

Amended claim 7 includes simulating the second font using the first font by automatically stripping a top line and a bottom line from the first font, wherein the first font comprises an $n \times (m+2)$ font and the second font comprises an $n \times m$ font.

Bril discloses a video font cache and a display memory that stores a plurality of fonts (Abstract). The Examiner's reference to Bril (col. 7, line 1 to col. 8, line 67) discloses storing a font in the display memory using a CPU generated address. Further, Bril discloses "scrambling" the CPU generated address to store the same font in the video font cache (Figure 5, col. 7, line 38- 41).

Thus, Bril rather discloses storing the same font data in the video font cache and display memory. In contrast, claim 7 refers to simulating the second font using the first font, wherein the first font comprises an $n \times (m+2)$ font and the second font comprises an $n \times m$ font.

Dawkins discloses displaying characters having different font sizes (Abstract), and similarly to Bril, fails to disclose simulating the second font using the first font, wherein the first

font comprises an $n \times (m+2)$ font and the second font comprises an $n \times m$ font, as recited in claim 7.

IBM discloses replacing 9×16 font with 8×16 font, and similarly to Bril and Dawkins, fails to disclose simulating the second font using the first font, wherein the first font comprises an $n \times (m+2)$ font and the second font comprises an $n \times m$ font, as recited in claim 7.

Thus, neither Bril, Dawkins, IBM, nor a combination thereof discloses simulating the second font using the first font, wherein the first font comprises an $n \times (m+2)$ font and the second font comprises an $n \times m$ font, as recited in claim 7.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bril, in view of Dawkins, and further in view of IBM.

Given that claims 13, 17, and 31 contain related limitations, applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 17, and 31 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bril, in view of Dawkins, and further in view of IBM.

Given that claims 8-10, 50, 54, 14, 51, 55, 18, 52, 56, 32-34, 53, and 58 depend from amended claims 7, 13, 17, and 31 respectively, applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-10, 50, 54, 14, 51, 55, 18, 52, 56, 32-34, 53, and 58 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bril, in view of Dawkins, and further in view of IBM.

With respect to amended claim 20, as set forth above, neither Bril, Dawkins, IBM, nor a combination thereof, discloses, teaches or suggests a processor that is configured to emulate a second font using the first font, wherein the second font is different from the first font.

Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 20 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bril, in view of Dawkins, and further in view of IBM.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 13 2006

Given that claims 21-24, 40-44, 46-49, 57, 60, and 61 contain related limitations, applicant respectfully submits that claims 13, 17, and 31 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bril, in view of Dawkins, and further in view of IBM.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 12/13/2006

By: 

James C. Scheller
Reg. No. 31,195

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300